

REMARKS

Claims 17-46 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 17-19, 22, 25-28, 31, 34, 35, and 41 were amended. Accordingly, claims 17-46 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 17-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hartman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,411). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 17 is amended to clarify that the information processing method processes information between a plurality of service providers and a user, and that each of the plurality of service providers has a corresponding service provider device.

Hartman et al. is directed to a method and system for single-action ordering of items in a client-server environment. (Hartman col. 3, lines 31-33.) In Hartman, a server system assigns a unique client identifier to a purchaser on client system. (Hartman col. 3, lines 37-38.) When a purchaser using a unique client identifier places an order, the client system sends the order information along with the purchaser's unique client identifier to the server system. (Hartman col. 3, lines 46-49.) The server system stores purchaser-specific order information on the server system, associating the purchaser-specific order information with the unique client identifier. (Hartman col. 3, lines 38-46.) When the purchaser places another order, if single-action ordering is enabled by the purchaser, the purchaser may place the order by performing a single action, since the server system has the purchaser-specific order information stored. (Hartman col. 3, lines 49-59.)

Hartman et al. does not disclose or suggest using an information processing apparatus (e.g., a proxy server) for processing information between a plurality of service providers and a user, and each of the plurality of service providers has a corresponding service provider device, as recited in independent claim 17. Rather, Hartman et al. only discloses storing personal information on a server system of a single service provider (e.g., Amazon.com) to allow that service provider to utilize the stored personal information to quickly process future purchases. Therefore, claim 17 and claims 18-25, which depend from claim 17, are allowable over Hartman et al.


For reasons similar to those discussed regarding claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-46 are also allowable over Hartman et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

II. Conclusions

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 27, 2006

By: 
Marina N. Saito
Registration No. 42,121
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000